



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/644,676	08/24/2000	Xiaohong Peng	261-102P-WLK	3000

7590 09/26/2003

LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM L. KLIMA, P.C.
P.O. Box 2855
Stafford, VA 22555-2855

EXAMINER

MCCROSKEY, DAVID J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3736

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/644,676	PENG, XIAOHONG <i>[initials]</i>	
	Examiner David J. McCrosky	Art Unit 3736	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claims 2, 3 and 6-16 is withdrawn in view of the new rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 and 35 USC § 101

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, "reagent" should be replaced with --kit--. The components require that there be no mixture in advance otherwise there would be an immediate reaction. The two components must remain separate in a kit.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said first compound" in lines 3 and 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In line 6, "hydrogen" should be replaced with --hydrogen--.

In line 2 of claim 7, sticks are not cotton.

Claims 12-16 provide for the use of an ovulation-period-detecting reagent, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it

Art Unit: 3736

merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Foster. Foster discloses 1.5% by weight of hydrogen peroxide and 2.5% by weight of a color reagent e.g. guaiac or benzidine. See col. 2, ll. 10-24 and ll. 62-71.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster as applied to claim 1 above. Foster discloses a method, system and kit having all of the

features claimed except for a stabilizing agent with a content of 0.01-0.02%. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a stabilizing agent such as EDTA since it is well known that hydrogen peroxide can be unstable under certain conditions.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster in view of Jaunakais. Foster discloses 1.5% by weight of hydrogen peroxide and 2.5% by weight of a color reagent e.g. guaiac or benzidine. See col. 2, ll. 10-24 and ll. 62-71. Foster further discloses a test paper, cloth strip or porous and absorbent wood strips. See col. 2, ll. 3-6. Foster does not disclose a transparent container. However, Jaunakais demonstrates that it is well known in the art to provide a kit containing a test strip and transparent container when viewing a color reagent. See Figure 3 and col. 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Foster with a transparent container, as taught by Jaunakais, for improved observation of a color reaction.

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Foster. Foster discloses 1.5% by weight of hydrogen peroxide and 2.5% by weight of a color reagent e.g. guaiac or benzidine. See col. 2, ll. 10-24 and ll. 62-71. The composition of Foster inherently possesses the function and properties claimed. Mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in prior art, does not cause claims drawn to those things to distinguish over prior art. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Regarding claim 13, Foster discloses a method, system and kit having all of the features claimed except for a stabilizing agent with a content of 0.01-0.02%. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a stabilizing agent such as EDTA since it is well known that hydrogen peroxide can be unstable under certain conditions.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Foster teaches the claimed invention as detailed above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. McCrosky whose telephone number is 703-305-1331. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max F. Hindenburg can be reached on 703-308-3130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

DJM


MAX F. HINDENBURG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700